

220 Heymann Boulevard
Lafayette, Louisiana 70503
Phone: (337) 233-0300
Fax: (337) 233-0694

Durio, McGoffin, Stagg &
Ackermann

Fax

Y
OFFICIAL
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 31 2003

To: Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks	From: William W. Stagg
Fax: 703-872-9310	Pages: 10
Phone: 703-308-0684	Date: October 30, 2003

Re: Serial Number: 09/900,264 - "Method for Handling and Disposing of Drill Cuttings" ATTN: Popovics, Robert J.

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

• Comments:

Filing of Response to Office Action of September 30, 2003

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This facsimile transmission and any documents accompanying are intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above, and may contain information which is confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this facsimile, and any reliance on the information contained in this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

DURIO, McGOFFIN, STAGG & ACKERMANN

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

220 HEYMANN BOULEVARD

P.O. BOX 51308

LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA 70505-1308

337-233-0300

FAX 337-233-0694

*ALSO CERTIFIED TO PRACTICE BEFORE
THE U.S. PATENT OFFICE OR IN OTHER STATESSTEVEN G. DURIO
GARY McGOFFIN
WILLIAM W. STAGG*
JEFFREY ACKERMANN
JAMES R. SHELTONOF COUNSEL:
GENE BROUSSARDDANIEL C. PALMINTIER
ROBERT L. BROUSSARD
JACQUES E. deMOSS*
TIFFANY B. THORNTON
RANDALL M. GLIDRY
JULIETTE BUSBY WADE
SHAWN A. CARTER

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of
Kenneth J. Boute and Ban D. GreenSerial No. 09/900,264
Filing Date: July 26, 2001

Examiner: Popovics, Robert J.

For: Method for Handling
and Disposing of Drill Cuttings


Art Unit: 1724

Mail Stop Patent Application
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450*****
October 30, 2003

Dear Sir:

Enclosed is a Response to the Office Action on the merits dated September 30, 2003 in
the above identified application.

With kindest regards, I am

Very truly yours,

 William W. Stagg
 Reg. No. 31,225
 Attorney for Applicant


WWS/lmk

Enclosures: Response to Office Action of 09/30/03
Certificate of Transmission

www.uspto.gov/patent/apply/337-233-0694

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I, Lucinda M. Kennedy, certify that the foregoing Response to Office Action of September 30, 2003 is being transmitted by facsimile transmission pursuant to 37 CFR 1.6 on this 30th day of October, 2003.



LUCINDA M. KENNEDY

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of
Kenneth J. Boute and Dan D. Green

Serial No. 09/900,264

Filing Date: July 26, 2001

Examiner: Popovics, Robert J.

For: Method for handling
and Disposing of Drill Cuttings

Art Unit: 1724

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2003

October 30, 2003

Mail Stop Patent Application
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action of September 30, 2003, kindly note the following:

The Applicants hereby amend their Claims by electing claims 1 - 10 and 22 - 35 for further examination, withdrawing from consideration Claims 11 - 21 as set forth on the following sheet entitled "Amendments to Claims".

REMARKS

1. In Applicants' response to Office Action 01 dated June 26, 2003 Applicants added four (4) new claims, claims 32 - 35. Applicant now has 35 total claims. In the Office Action 02 of September 30, 2003 the Examiner found that Claims 1-9 (sic, actually 1-10) and 21 - 36(sic, actually 22-35) were drawn to a Method of Processing Drill Cuttings, classified in Class 175, Subclass 66 and that Claims 10 - 20 (sic, actually 11 - 21) were drawn to a Separator Apparatus, classified in Class 209, Subclass 13. It was thought by the Examiner that these inventions were distinct and that restriction for examination purposes is proper. The undersigned attorney for Applicants attempted to reach the Examiner by telephone to clarify the claim numbers but was unable to do so.